REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending. Claim 3 is cancelled.

Claims 1-3, 13-17 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Richards, U.S. Patent No. 6,507,829, in view of Kapp, U.S. Application Publication No. 2002-0010595. Claims 4-12 are also rejected under 35 USC 102(b) over Richards. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 13 have been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 3 to clarify that a drug rule syntax comprises drug rule syntax elements and the possible logical relationships between them.

The present invention may be used to identify drug rules and/or drug rule content in a drug information source and to parse that information into computer-readable syntax, e.g., "if ___, and if ___ and not ____ then _____." Neither Richards nor Kapp discloses or suggests the invention.

The Richards patent is directed to categorizing, or "coding," adverse event reports, called verbatims, generated during clinical trials of pharmaceutical products. During the training mode (in which the system is "trained" to recognize verbatims), a series of verbatims are provided to the system and each verbatim is broken into segments and assigned a ranking. Richards refers to this process as "parsing." Then, each ranked segment, or "n-gram," is assigned a weight vector. Various refinements take place to complete the system training. Then, the system is used in the classification mode. "In the classification mode, verbatims from actual clinical trials are truthed according to the particular classification for which the system has been trained." Richards, 7:48-50.

The office action asserts that Richards teaches "creating . . . a syntax (col. 9, lines 10-15)." The claims have been amended to clarify that a syntax comprises syntax elements and their possible logical relationships. Richards does not disclose creating a syntax comprising syntax elements and their possible relationships. Col. 9, lines 10-15 of Richards merely discloses a verbatim that has been parsed into various fragments which have then been weighted.

The office action also asserts that Richards teaches "and parsing . . . elements from at least one identified instance of . . . content into the . . . rule syntax, retaining associations between those drug rule elements that form a . . . whereby a subset of the drug information source is processed into syntax-parsed . . . (col. 5, lines 35-40; col. 6, lines 20-29)." As mentioned above, the claims have been amended to clarify that a syntax comprises syntax elements and their possible logical relationships. Richards does not disclose parsing elements of content into a rule syntax. As discussed above, Richards discloses parsing adverse events into segments and then ranking the segments. Richards does not disclose retaining the associations between drug rule element. The portions of the Richards specification cited only refer to the breaking up of verbatims into segments so that each segment may be ranked.

In short, the disclosure of Richards has very little to do with the subject matter of the present invention.

In view of the foregoing, and to the extent that the office action relies upon the cited portions of Richards for disclosing elements of the present claims, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

The office action correctly notes that Richards does not disclose drug rules. However, the office action asserts that Kapp discloses drug rules, citing paragraph 13, lines 1-5.

Kapp discloses a drug database containing information on the usage, dosing and contra-indications for a plurality of drugs. Kapp, ¶13, lines 1-5. Kapp further discloses that the information in the database can be changed through additions, deletions and modifications by at least one drug information provider. Kapp, ¶13, lines 11-14. Kapp fails to disclose or suggest creating a drug rule syntax or that drug rule information from a drug information source might be parsed into a drug rule syntax.

As with the disclosure of Richards, the disclosure of Kapp has very little to do with the subject matter of the present invention. Accordingly, the rejections of claims based on Richards and/or Kapp may properly be withdrawn.

In view of the above, each of the claims in this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicants solicit early action in the form of a Notice of Allowance.

In the event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing **Docket No. 597932000320**.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 8, 2008   By: _____

Peter J. Davis
Registration No. 36,119

Morrison & Foerster LLP
1650 Tysons Boulevard, Suite 400
McLean, Virginia 22102
Telephone: (703) 760-7748
Facsimile: (703) 760-7777